

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 46839

Title: Clinical outcomes of endoscopic management of pancreatic fluid collections in cirrhotics vs non-cirrhotics: A comparative study

Reviewer's code: 00069105

Reviewer's country: Spain

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-03 10:31

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-03 18:15

Review time: 7 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The manuscript is about a not usually written topic: results of endoscopic management of WON and Pancreatic pseudocyst in cirrhotics. Main problem is that the experience is short only five patients so conclusions should be only suggestions. I think that the

results seems not good but the patients that they treated are very fragile patients. So possibly with other treatments would be even worse Comments: Introduction: OK. Methodology: Two of the exclusion criteria are, I would say, curious: Patients with regional varices and coagulopathy (international normalized ratio > 1.5), thrombocytopenia (platelets < 50,000/mm³). Perhaps more cirrhotics patients could be included if you excluded these criteria. Could you comment this point? You said that similar number of procedures were done in both groups but in cirrhotics group there were two casualties so you are comparing 24 vs 3. Discussion: You explain perfectly the limitations of your study so I think that your conclusions should be less taxative Tables: no tables in my document so I could not talk about tables. References: not too much and some of them a little bit old. Figures: 3 and 4 could be joined and I think that could be better images specially figure 3.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 46839

Title: Clinical outcomes of endoscopic management of pancreatic fluid collections in cirrhotics vs non-cirrhotics: A comparative study

Reviewer's code: 03026651

Reviewer's country: Lebanon

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-03 15:45

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-03 22:36

Review time: 6 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

it's better to put a figure of the SEMs used.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
<https://www.wjgnet.com>

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 46839

Title: Clinical outcomes of endoscopic management of pancreatic fluid collections in cirrhotics vs non-cirrhotics: A comparative study

Reviewer's code: 03720781

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-05 13:41

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-05 14:31

Review time: 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is the first study to report the use of SEMS for EUS-guided transmural drainage of symptomatic PFCs in cirrhotic patients although the sample size is too few to be control group. Larger, multicenter studies are warranted to further characterize the risk profile

and outcomes in these patients.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 46839

Title: Clinical outcomes of endoscopic management of pancreatic fluid collections in cirrhotics vs non-cirrhotics: A comparative study

Reviewer's code: 03494395

Reviewer's country: Taiwan

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-06 10:53

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-06 11:00

Review time: 1 Hour

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1. Does this manuscript conform to the definition of Original Research articles? Yes 2. Is the language, specifically the grammar, of sufficient quality? Yes 3. Does the title clearly and precisely reflect the findings of the manuscript? Yes 4. Are the statistical methods



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

used validate? Yes 5. Is the discussion generalized and discussed in detail? Yes 6. Is prior work properly and fully cited? Yes 7. The authors can cite the following papers: J Hepatol. 2018 Oct;69(4):970-972.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 46839

Title: Clinical outcomes of endoscopic management of pancreatic fluid collections in cirrhotics vs non-cirrhotics: A comparative study

Reviewer's code: 02510721

Reviewer's country: Italy

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-03 13:28

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-06 17:53

Review time: 3 Days and 4 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

To Authors This study develops well and completely the mini-invasive management of the pancreatic fluid collection, complex clinical problem, in particular in cirrhotic patients. I have some observations and suggestions: In the Introduction can be useful to

add some detailed but short pathological characteristics on pancreatic pseudocysts and walled-off necrosis. Moreover it's need some clinical data on the symptomatic evolution of these pancreatic lesions; are not enough the very schematic data reported in the Methods. I suggest to define the section Patients and Methods and to add the data about the cohort of patients with the demographic and basic pathological features. Consequently in the Results can be reported the details of the results of the treatment. In the Discussion should be very interesting to develop synthetically the subject of the connections between the cirrhosis and pancreatitis. In the final paragraph of the Discussion there is a general reference to literature review on "management of PFC using SEMS....." In my opinion should necessary to mention at least the bibliographic data of the studies that can be reported within the references.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ [Y] No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 46839

Title: Clinical outcomes of endoscopic management of pancreatic fluid collections in cirrhotics vs non-cirrhotics: A comparative study

Reviewer's code: 03105713

Reviewer's country: Turkey

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-03 21:35

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-06 20:53

Review time: 2 Days and 23 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

It can be better describe only cirrhotic patients' in details instead comparing them with non-cirrhotic patients. I am curious about why this mortalities happened.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

PEER-REVIEW REPORT

Name of journal: World Journal of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy

Manuscript NO: 46839

Title: Clinical outcomes of endoscopic management of pancreatic fluid collections in cirrhotics vs non-cirrhotics: A comparative study

Reviewer's code: 03024207

Reviewer's country: China

Science editor: Fang-Fang Ji

Reviewer accepted review: 2019-03-06 12:58

Reviewer performed review: 2019-03-12 15:27

Review time: 6 Days and 2 Hours

SCIENTIFIC QUALITY	LANGUAGE QUALITY	CONCLUSION	PEER-REVIEWER STATEMENTS
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	Peer-Review:
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language	(High priority)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anonymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good	polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Accept	<input type="checkbox"/> Onymous
<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of	(General priority)	Peer-reviewer's expertise on the
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Do not	language polishing	<input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision	topic of the manuscript:
publish	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejection	<input type="checkbox"/> Major revision	<input type="checkbox"/> Advanced
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rejection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General
			<input type="checkbox"/> No expertise
			Conflicts-of-Interest:
			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

SPECIFIC COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

1.This manuscript focused on the EUS-guided drainage of PFCs in cirrhotics and the authors found that EUS-guided management of PFC using SEMS placement has a high technical and clinical success rate in non-cirrhotics, while in cirrhotics caution must be



**Baishideng
Publishing
Group**

7041 Koll Center Parkway, Suite
160, Pleasanton, CA 94566, USA
Telephone: +1-925-223-8242
Fax: +1-925-223-8243
E-mail: bpgoffice@wjgnet.com
https://www.wjgnet.com

exercised given the high morbidity and mortality. However, there were only 5 patients with cirrhosis included in the study which made the conclusion of limited value. 2. No tables were available in the manuscript or the attached files. 3. There were no definition of cirrhotic patients in the manuscript. Whether the patients were compensated or decompensated, with or without complications were not clear. 4. The author contributions were not clear in the manuscript.

INITIAL REVIEW OF THE MANUSCRIPT

Google Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No

BPG Search:

- ☐ The same title
- ☐ Duplicate publication
- ☐ Plagiarism
- ☐ No